



Town Meeting



Bulletin OF AMERICA'S
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
Sponsored by THE READER'S DIGEST

Should We Continue the Draft for at Least Two Years?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

HAROLD BURTON
H. R. BAUKHAGE

CLARENCE J. BROWN
EDWIN CARL JOHNSON

(See also page 12)

COMING SEPTEMBER 27th

Topic to be announced later pending
current events.

TUNE IN EVERY THURSDAY, AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY—8:30 p.m., E.W.T.

★ ★ ★ CONTENTS ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 13:

"Should We Continue the Draft for at Least Two Years?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Senator BURTON	4
Congressman BROWN	6
Mr. BAUKHAGE	8
Senator JOHNSON	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16



THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 20:

"Who Should Control the Atomic Bomb?"



THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 27:

Topic to be announced later pending current events.

The Broadcast of September 13, 1945, originated in the Taft Auditorium in Cincinnati, Ohio, from 8:30 to 9:30 Eastern War Time, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published weekly by *The Reader's Digest*. Town Meeting Publication Office: 32 South Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1897.



Town Meeting

Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air



George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator

Should We Continue the Draft for at Least Two Years?

Announcer:

The Reader's Digest, America's most widely read magazine, invites you to listen to another stirring session of America's Town Meeting, the program that gives you both sides of issues affecting your life and mine. America's Town Meeting is produced by the Town Hall of New York.

Tonight, here at the Taft Auditorium in Cincinnati, Ohio, where we are the guests of the Cincinnati Town Meeting Host Committee and WSAI, four authorities clash over a question of great interest to all families with members in the armed forces and families with sons who will soon be eighteen.

Now to open this important session, *The Reader's Digest* brings you the president of Town Hall and founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Tonight's subject, another of our postwar problems, is what is known as a "hot potato." Our present Selective Service Act will expire next May 15, unless it is renewed or extended by Congress. The mail of the members of Congress for the past few weeks has been flooded with letters from parents, wives, and relatives about getting their men home and out of the armed forces.

There are about 11,500,000 men and women now in uniform and both Army and Navy expect to reduce this total, by discharging men on points, to approximately 3,000,000 by next July. Most men in the services are in for the duration and six months. But neither Congress nor the President has declared the duration over, and the draft continues to bring in about 50,000 new men each month.

The Navy, which already has about 300,000 men enlisted for four years, feels that it can maintain a force of 500,000 men and fifty officers—all it needs for peacetime—by voluntary enlistment.

The Army, however, feels that it must have at least 2,500,000 men for present peacetime needs, at least while we are policing Germany and Japan. As it does not feel that this quota can be met on a volunteer basis, the Army wants an extension of the draft for at least two years.

Senator Harold H. Burton, Republican of Ohio, and Baukhage, well-known American Broadcasting Company commentator support the Army's contention. Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Democrat of Colorado, and Congressman Clarence J. Brown, Republican of Ohio, oppose this view. There's a pretty strong argument on both sides.

So let's hear both sides right now beginning with the Senator from Ohio, the Honorable Harold H. Burton, member of both the Senate Military Affairs Committee and the Appropriation Committee, Senator Burton. (*Applause.*)

Senator Burton:

Mr. Denny and my colleagues, if the question were, "Should we now adopt universal compulsory military training?" I would answer, "No."

If the question were, "Should we now authorize the continuance

indefinitely of the Selective Service draft?" I would answer, "No."

But as the question is, "Should we now authorize the continuance of the draft for at least two years?" I answer, "Yes, in order to replace our war veterans."

My reasons are two: first, to make sure of our victory; second, to bring home our veterans. We cannot bring home all our veterans promptly unless we continue the draft.

First, in order to make sure of our hard-won victories, we must not falter now in the occupation and redirection of Germany and Japan. I thank God that we can do this without further loss of time and without further loss of life. But it's still serious business with the peace of the future in the balance.

This service by our troops of occupation is important military duty. It is not mere peacetime training. It is actual service. We cannot neglect it and keep faith with those who did the fighting. Our Allies will also be doing their share of this duty.

Second, unless we continue the draft for the present, this vital service of military occupation will have to be rendered largely by our veterans who are now in the service. Most of those who would thus have to do this after next July will have had more than two years of service.

I ask my opponents tonight to think of them. Many have served overseas. Many have children or other dependents. Many have interrupted their education and careers. Two years or more is enough. They are entitled to come home as soon as America can arrange it, and also to be assured of international peace, justice, and security.

We must find a way to replace them. The natural suggestion is to enlist volunteers. With that, I agree, as far as it will go. To do this, we should make our armed services more attractive. I am even ready to indulge in wishful thinking to the extent of assuming that we can by voluntary enlistments meet the entire needs of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

This will, however, leave a need for an Army of about 2,500,000 men. Of these, about 500,000 will be in Europe, and about 900,000 in Japan or elsewhere overseas. We cannot produce such an Army without recourse to many of our men who already have seen long and hard wartime service, unless we continue the selective draft to relieve them.

Of our present Army all but about 800,000 already have had a year of service. So that, out of the 2,500,000 remaining in service, nearly two-thirds, or about 1,700,000, already have had more than one year of service and by next July, when the demobilization

should be stabilized, will have had more than two years of service.

The problem is, how can we best proceed to get these men back to their homes and also do our full part in consolidating our victories?

The Army estimates that by next July we can get 300,000 volunteers. The draft would bring in 500,000 more. Add these to the 800,000 who will have less than two years of service and it still leaves in the Army 900,000 men with over two years of service and entitled to early release. These 900,000 may possibly be relieved later in part by extraordinary steps, reorganizing our service, reducing our requirements abroad and increasing our volunteers.

To my mind, one thing is sure, we need at least to authorize the continuation of the draft in order to relieve the additional 500,000 long-service veterans whom these draftees could surely replace by next July.

We do not need now to authorize the draft indefinitely, but we do need now to authorize it for two years, and in fairness to our war veterans, we should not hesitate. The war is not really over, the peace is not really secure, the job is not yet done. If we want peace, justice, and security, we must not fail to go through with our security program.

The price of peace is eternal vigilance. America must not fail to do its full duty by her veterans

and by their children. They are the hope of America and the hope of the world. But the veterans have done their share in the Army. They are needed at home. The time has come for others to take their place in uniform. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Burton. You gentlemen from Ohio don't seem to agree on this question. Here's Congressman Brown, a fellow Republican and member of the House Rules Committee who's ready to take issue with you. So let's hear now from Congressman Clarence J. Brown, of Blanchester, Ohio. Congressman Brown. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Brown:

The answer to the question, "Shall We Continue the Draft for at Least Two More Years?" depends upon whether we accept as correct the figures and statements of the War Department. Senator Burton seemingly does. I do not. Instead, I believe the War Department is asking for a larger peacetime Army than it needs or expects to get.

I also believe the War Department's statement, "Combat veterans and fathers of minor children will have to remain in the Army indefinitely unless we continue the draft," is deliberate propaganda. (*Applause.*) If I did not so believe, I would not be here tonight.

The time has come for plain talk in America. The one real pro-

moter of continued conscription is the War Department, for the Navy believes its future needs can be filled through voluntary enlistment.

Actually, this draft-continuing policy has been fixed by but a mere handful of high officials, but in the Army what your superior officer says goes or else, and every old soldier knows it. These officials contend we need a peacetime Army of 2,500,000 from next July on, with 900,000 in the Pacific, 500,000 in Europe, and 1,100,000 here in the United States.

I challenge these figures. Remember, they are from the very same men who less than a week before Japan's capitulation, when they knew peace overtures were being made, insisted we needed an Army of 8,300,000. They told us after Japan had quit that we must continue to draft 100,000 men a month. They insisted we needed at least 850,000 soldiers for occupation duty in Japan.

Now, Generals Eichelberger and MacArthur indicate a much smaller Occupation Army—perhaps only 300,000 will be sufficient—after the Japs are disarmed, and, by the way, what's wrong, anyhow, with getting a little help from China, Russia, Great Britain, France, Australia, the Netherlands and the Philippines in policing Japan? (*Applause.*)

Unbiased reports from Europe suggest we can easily control our

portion of the Reich with 200,000 men by next summer. Why do we need a peacetime Army of 1,100,000 men within the continental United States?

Of course, it takes a big Army to support 1,600 generals (*ap-
plause*), but the time has come to return many of our Pentagon generals back to being majors and captains again. (*Applause.*)

Our War Department policy makers are not infallible. Did not they tell us that we had to draft Army nurses and then within three months, after we refused to do so, stop accepting nurse enlistments?

Didn't they tell us we would have to conscript all labor and propose the iniquitous Labor-Draft Bill?

Didn't these policy makers promise, if granted the power to draft 18-year-olds, every boy would receive at least a year's training, and then send thousands of them to death with only a few weeks drill?

Didn't they promise parents of boys under 18 if their lads would volunteer they would be given specialized training in college or as air cadets, and then transfer them to the infantry and overseas with but little preparation?

No, my friends, Baukhage and Burton may believe, but I do not believe all I hear, especially from the War Department. (*Applause.*) The War Department policy makers favor compulsory peacetime

military training and have proposed legislation therefor to the Congress.

Do they think the continuation of the draft for two more years will pave the way for permanent peacetime conscription?

These officials argue the inability to get sufficient voluntary enlistments. How do they know? They've never tried. The House Military Affairs Committee believes differently, and unanimously so, and has approved a recruitment bill permitting enlistment for either two or three years, choice of service branch and location, war-time base pay with 20 per cent added for overseas duty, enlistment bonus for each year previously served, furloughs up to 90 days with transportation home, full coverage under the G. I. Bill of Rights, mustering-out pay of \$300, and retirement pay of 50 per cent after 20 years service, or 75 per cent after 30 years.

Government agencies predict from five to ten million unemployed by mid-winter. If so, don't you believe the Army can get more than 300,000 volunteers in the next year under the provisions of this recruitment bill?

For the last four years, War Department officials have been riding high. Anyone who opposed them was branded unpatriotic or pro-Hitler. Then their cry was, "Don't you know there's a war on?" Now

it's time that they learned there is a peace on. (*Applause.*)

Instead of continuing conscription, we should be demobilizing our armed forces and returning to the voluntary enlistment method of obtaining men for occupation and other peacetime military duties as rapidly as possible. Instead of urging continuation of the draft, our leaders should be trying to get all the other nations of the world to join us in permanently abandoning peacetime military conscription. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Brown.

Now you're about to hear another statement from the other side of the fence by a man whose last name you know, but whose first name and initials are still a mystery. The well-known commentator of the American Broadcasting Company, "Baukhage talking." Baukhage. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Baukhage:

Yes, Baukhage talking, and talking just as positively on the positive side of this question as Representative Brown is positive about the negative. Believe me, I don't believe everything I hear, either—some of the things I've just heard included. (*Laughter and applause.*)

With all due respect to the gentleman from Ohio, who has just spoken, I shall try to go ahead and supplement the remarks of my colleague, Senator Burton, and at-

tempt to answer this evening's question, even though I do accept the figures and the statements of the War Department.

I don't necessarily think that the War Department is infallible. I'm like the GI on the little jungle island that went up and asked permission to marry one of the very primitive native girls. When the chaplain tried to dissuade him and said, "Why would you want such a person for a wife?" he replied, "Well, sir, where can I go from here to get a better one?" (*Laughter.*)

Of course, the War Department isn't infallible. It is fallible. They made mistakes but, after all, they brought us the victory in the greatest war in history in two theaters, (*applause*) and they seem to be pretty reliable for the acts and facts and figures. I know of no better, anyhow. They're willing to revise their figures, too.

As I see it, the United States has accepted an international policy involving certain obligations. The Government has asked the War and Navy Departments to implement that policy and carry out the obligations involved.

The military experts—the highest authority on military affairs that we have—have been asked what that entails and they have given their views to Congress. Now they are awaiting the decision.

Well, first let's see what this policy of ours involves. There are three main points as outlined by the President: first, we must maintain adequate defense forces on this continent and all our bases overseas; second, we must bear our share, as a member of the United Nations, of the security measures to check aggression; and, third, we are committed to armed occupation in the lands where we wish to assure that the purposes of this victory shall be carried out.

To meet these obligations requires a certain number of men in our armed forces. We now have an Army of 8,050,000 men. At the present rate of discharge, as Senator Burton pointed out at the beginning, there will be 1,700,000 veterans of two or more years' service in the Army by next July.

Well, now if the present rate of induction is continued, 500,000 new men will be added by the draft. An additional campaign will be started to recruit these 300,000 volunteers. Altogether, the total number of veterans, inductees, and volunteers would be sufficient to meet our needs. Well, that's very fine, isn't it. But what would happen if we took Senator—Representative Johnson's—*(Laughter.)* All right. You're promoted, Senator Johnson—if we took their advice and stopped our induction.

It would mean 500,000 young men wouldn't have their ordered lives disturbed. They could go

ahead and enjoy their school days and their baseball and their movies, while 500,000 others won't get their discharges—boys who have done their bit, who've sweated it out there in the foxholes and have dreamed and hoped for the day when their share of the victory would be only a chance to get home. *(Applause.)*

Is that the American way? Is that democracy, where we're supposed to share each other's burdens for the greatest good of the greatest number?

Well, you give the quick and easy answer. Get them all by volunteers. That's the American way, too, yes. It's the American tradition. The peacetime draft, I know, is not.

But, I might say to Representative Brown, I haven't met many Army men who believe that those men can be raised by the volunteer system. You know after the last war men were selling apples on the street corners and there were soup kitchen lines from here to Halifax. In spite of all that the recruiting officers did then, we didn't even reach a goal of more than, well, 120,000, I believe. I could tell you some more stories of the way I and some of the other men felt when they came out of the Army—how anxious we were to continue our service, almost at servitude. *(Laughter.)*

But granted the volunteer system will do all Representative Brown

says it will, we still have to underwrite that system with the system that we already have and we know will work.

You can't escape from three choices, if you argue to stop induction. You must repudiate the obligations which America accepted in her policy of international cooperation and chuck all the blood and sweat and tears of this war without having assured the achievement of the very things we were fighting for. Or, you must assume you know more than the military men and the President about what is needed to carry out these obligations. Or, you must be willing to help the young man who has not been called upon to do his part in the war evade his duty at the expense of the men who risked their lives. Is that justice? Is it democracy? Is it common sense? (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Baukhage. Now that you've got your Congressman Brown and your Senator Johnson straightened out, you seem to have stirred up a little trouble with the Democratic Senator from Colorado who's also a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson of Colorado. Senator Johnson. (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. Since a certain infamous day in Decem-

ber, 1941, Americans have been jarred frequently, as Clarence Brown has stated, by some saucy clerk with the potent remark, "There is a war on."

Now the shoe is on the other foot. Senator Burton and Mr. Baukhage, I call your attention to this fact: There is not a war on. This Republic is at peace with all the world.

I agree that the draft is an equitable and effective way to mobilize a huge military force when a nation is at war, but I repeat the proposal before us tonight is not to conscript men in time of war but to conscript American youth during a time of peace.

Now that Italy, Germany, and Japan are thoroughly defeated, American militarists cannot give up their greatest passion—conscription. They are begging for just two more years of it. Two more years will give them the time they so desperately need to think up some other dodge to put over peacetime conscription. (*Applause.*)

Furthermore, two years will carry them beyond the next election. The real purpose of the proposal is to maintain a huge armed force. Its real object is to make nice military sinecures for the colonels and the generals. The conscripters base their support for their two-year plea on the fiction that each man drafted will permit a battle-scarred veteran to

come home. That allegation is a fraud and a humbug.

On September 1, 1945, four months after the collapse of Germany, there were still 12,000,000 men in the armed forces. With this Republic at peace, the Army and the Navy and the Congress should be devoting their talents toward getting men out and not getting men into the armed forces. (*Applause.*)

The education of all America's teen-age youth should be our prime objective. They are the hope of humanity. To make international police out of them is the most stupid proposal ever to be advanced by an enlightened nation. (*Applause.*) Civilization must not be sacrificed on the altar of the imperial order of American brass hats.

I should not have such strenuous objections to this vicious proposal if only men over 50 were to be drafted. A lot of stuffed shirts in and out of uniform shouting for military slavery might themselves make pretty good policemen — at least, the enemy wouldn't fraternize with them.

What I object to is the conscription of American youth. What does an 18-year-old youngster know about the intrigues of Berlin and Tokyo. It is a job for a more mature mind, so I say keep our youth in school for future economic and military security and let radio commentators and Sen-

ators assume the job which age and nature have equipped them so well to handle.

Every student of history must view the future with concern. Our survival as a great power rests with the technical training and education which we give to our annual crop of teen-age youth.

For four years we have been expending them freely. There must be an end to this reckless extravagance unless America wants to join the parade of "has-been nations." Germany is reduced to military impotence. Rapidly she is being reduced to industrial impotence.

The same thing will shortly be Japan's lot. When the Japs turn over all their weapons to MacArthur, she will be as harmless and as helpless as a fangless rattlesnake. The only job then will be to keep her that way.

I note that Belgium is begging to send an army of occupation of 50,000 soldiers into Germany. We should grant her request promptly and enthusiastically. Europe wants to police Germany.

Four hundred million Chinese and 170,000,000 Russians want to police Japan. I say encourage them to do so.

I should like to see 10,000 experienced and trained American observers stationed in Germany and Japan to keep us fully posted on what goes on. Other than

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HILMAR ROBERT BAUKHAGE—"Baukhage talking!" is the familiar greeting heard by many radio listeners when they tune in one of the popular news broadcasts. Mr. Baukhage was born in 1889, in La Salle, Illinois. He received a Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago and attended the universities of Bonn, Kiel, Jena, Freiburg, and the Sorbonne in Paris.

Even before his graduation from college he had a job on the *Chautauqua Daily*. In 1913 he was with the Paris Bureau of the *Pall Mall Gazette* of London. In 1914 he joined the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press. For a period he was assistant manager of *Leslie's* and from 1919 to 1932 was with the Consolidated Press as superintendent in San Francisco and Washington, and as superintendent and business manager in Chicago. From 1932 to 1937, he was on the staff of the *United States News*. Since 1940 he has been Washington correspondent for Western Newspaper Union.

From 1934 to 1942, Mr. Baukhage was a news commentator on the Farm and Home hour. From Berlin, in 1939, he broadcast for NBC the outbreak of the present war. He was the first person to broadcast from the White House the Pearl Harbor attack. Since 1942, Mr. Baukhage has been a Washington commentator for the Blue Network.

During World War I, Mr. Baukhage served in the AEF, and he covered the Paris Peace Conference for *Stars and Stripes*.

EDWIN CARL JOHNSON—Senator Johnson, Democrat from Colorado, was born in Scandia, Kansas, in 1884. He was raised on a cattle ranch in Nebraska. In 1910 he became a railroad laborer, advancing to telegrapher and train dispatcher. He homesteaded in northwestern Colorado and operated the Farmers' Co-operative Milling Elevator and a produce business for ten years at Craig, Colorado. From 1923 until 1931, Senator Johnson was a member of the House of Representatives of the Colorado Legisla-

ture. The next two years he was Lieutenant Governor of the state, and from 1933 to 1937—two terms—he was governor of the state. In November, 1936, he was elected to the U.S. Senate and was reelected in 1942.

CLARENCE J. BROWN—Newspaperman and Republican Congressman from Ohio, Clarence Brown was born in Blanchester, Ohio in 1893. He studied law at Washington and Lee University Law School from 1913 to 1915 and has an LL.D. degree from Wilmington College. Congressman Brown was appointed state statistician in 1915, but in 1917 he bought his first newspaper and continued in the publishing business since that date.

From 1919 to 1923, Congressman Brown was Lieutenant Governor of Ohio and from 1927 to 1933 he was Secretary of State for Ohio. He was the nominee of the Republican Party for Governor of Ohio but was not elected. He has been a delegate to many Republican National Conventions. Since 1939 he has been a member of the House of Representatives.

HAROLD H. BURTON—Republican Senator from Ohio, Harold H. Burton was born in Jamaica Plain, Mass. From Bowdoin College he received an A.B. degree and from Harvard, an LL.B. He practiced law in Cleveland from 1912 to 1914 and then became assistant attorney for the Utah Power and Light Company in Salt Lake City for two years. The next year he was attorney for the Idaho Power Company of Boise, Idaho. Returning to Cleveland, he continued the practice of law until 1935, when he was elected Mayor of Cleveland. To this position, he came with the added experience of a year as member of the Board of Education of East Cleveland, a term as representative in the Ohio Legislature, three years as director of law for the City of Cleveland, and several months as Acting Mayor. In November, 1940, he was elected to the United States Senate. In World War I, Senator Burton was a lieutenant and later a captain, and saw service in both Belgium and France.

that, we ought to keep out of Germany and Japan.

Under freedom of choice, America has scaled the highest pinnacles of science, of production, and of war. America is the victor tonight because of her devotion to

the free enterprise system. Under that system, all men—soldiers and craftsmen — traditionally have chosen their careers.

We can recruit all the soldiers we can possibly use, if only we will give the volunteer system an

honest trial. May God give us the judgment not to abandon the system which has made America great. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Johnson. Now, gentlemen, if you'll come up here around this microphone, let's see if we can iron out some of these difficulties you have suggested in your prepared statements. Senator Burton, you now have a chance to get at Senator Johnson and Congressman Brown. You have been awfully quiet and patient over there.

Senator Burton: Well, Senator Johnson, even though for a minute you forget the battle-scarred men, why do you disregard all the men that have been in more than two or three years and put them behind those that haven't been in at all?

Senator Johnson: I don't forget for one moment the battle-scarred veterans. I say get them out of the Army. You're planning to keep them in. If you want to get them out, why don't you draft enough men so that they can come out. You stated yourself here that even though we have the draft of 500,000, we are still going to have 750,000 of them left in there or 900,000 as you stated it.

Senator Burton: We would have 500,000 less left in there if you continue the draft plan than if you didn't. How long are you going

to try out this volunteer system before you know whether it works or not?

Senator Johnson: You say it won't work. It has never been tried.

Senator Burton: You don't know.

Senator Johnson: Well, I say that you don't need 2,500,000 men in this Army at the present time and you've got 8,050,000 men now.

Senator Burton: And left you a margin of safety of 900,000 above the draft.

Congressman Brown: Let me interject just long enough to tell both these men that they're overlooking the fact that you have over 2,000,000 men in the Army right now in the United States that have never seen any combat or ever been off American soil. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: That was Congressman Brown speaking.

Senator Burton: Congressman Brown, they've been away from their homes and their children and it's time they went back to their homes and children after two years. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Brown: Well, of course, Harold, they're not all married. I know there are a lot of them who would like to get out to get married, but they're not all married, after all. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Baukhage: A great many of those men, of course, are absolutely necessary for supplies. In

order merely to demobilize the Army we have now, we would require a great many troops here. Furthermore, a great many of those men in this country are not physically fit for foreign service. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Burton?

Senator Burton: Another question, Senator Johnson. If you don't believe the War Department, who do you believe for military authority and facts? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Johnson?

Senator Johnson: I believe in the American people and in their judgment. And I intend to go by the American people's judgment. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Brown, Congressman Brown?

Congressman Brown: Baukhage, you talk about the War Department winning victories for us in two wars. I've been under the impression that Eisenhower and MacArthur and George Patton and a lot of other fighting Americans, including several G.I. Joe's, had about as much to do with winning these victories as the Under Secretary of War, or any of the brass hats in Washington. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Baukhage: I'll take you right up on that, sir. The men who okeyed these figures last in the estimates were Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur. (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson: I'd like to reply to that, if I might, by saying that General MacArthur now says

they only need there about 350,000 men for occupation duty in Japan, and the brass hats in Washington say 850,000. Now who are you for—brass hats or MacArthur? Not only that, Clarence, but Eisenhower and MacArthur never have stated that we need 1,100,000 of these men who have been in the Army three and four years in the continental United States, in uniform. They've never said that!

Mr. Denny: Senator Burton?

Senator Burton: Senator Johnson, make allowance for all those figures and take the lowest one, and you still need the 500,000 men to take up the margin that's in there. You have 900,000 margin in those figures, even though you don't believe them. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Baukhage: There is one question I would like to ask the Senator?

Mr. Denny: Which Senator? The name is Johnson.

Mr. Baukhage: Well, I wasn't going to drag my colleague into any trouble here. (*Laughter.*) Senator Johnson, would you prefer to allow the future of Japan to be moulded by a Russian army of occupation? (*Applause.*)

Senator Johnson: Oh, I—I—I—I trust Russia. I'm not like some of you fellows who don't trust Russia at all. I trust Russia and I trust—I trust China. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Burton?

Senator Burton: I might merely add to that—I think they should

all be in there doing this duty together. That means that we should be in there, too; we can't walk out on the rest of them. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Congressman Brown?

Congressman Brown: Mr. Baukhage and Senator Burton insist it's impossible to get more than 300,000 volunteers for the Army. If so, what is wrong with the Army? The Navy says it can get 550,000 volunteers; the Marine Corps, 125,000; the Coast Guard, 35,000 or 40,000. What makes the Army so unattractive to our young men, as Baukhage says they are, if they'd rather sell apples than to join the Army? I can't understand it. There must be something wrong with your Army friends, Baukhage.

Mr. Denny: Baukhage, you were in the Army—suppose you tackle that.

Mr. Baukhage: Oh, I could tell you that. I prefer the Army myself, but the majority of eighteen-year-olds don't. The difficulty we had in scraping this barrel to get the eighteen-year-olds in—get the younger men in—was because the moment they got in, when they were inducted, they shot right for the Navy. They want to see the world! (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Burton?

Senator Burton: I might say this. I served in the infantry, but I noticed that my two sons went into the Navy and the Marine

Corps. But I want to say this: I think in the Army that has the front seat—the doughboy and the GI, in time of war—that is a place where they're willing to go in and do their jobs. But it's tough going in time of peace to serve in the Army. They'd rather go into the Air Corps or go into the Navy or go into the Marine Corps, and some into the Army. But when you raise 2,500,000 in the Army, as compared with 500,000 in the Navy, you have a different proposition.

Mr. Denny: Senator Johnson?

Senator Johnson: Yes, and there's another reason, too. In the Navy, they teach the boys something—they teach them a trade—and they pay them something. They pay them on a basis of progressive advancement. In the Army, they assign them to picking up cigarette stubs out on the barracks. They assign them to cutting lawns with their bayonets. They assign them to all sorts of menial tasks to take up their time—simply wasting their time—and you can't fool the American boy. Now, if we'll pay the American soldier something, teach him something, give him some opportunity for his progress and his advancement, you won't have any trouble about your volunteers. (*Applause.*)

Senator Burton: Senator Johnson, that's not the kind of recruiting talk that'll get men into the

Army instead of into the Navy, that you have given. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, gentlemen. We've got an eager Cincinnati audience here of more than 25,000 people who are ready to pepper you fellows with questions. So you'd better take a cool, refreshing drink, while we pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of questions vitally important to you,

sponsored by the most widely read of all magazines, *The Reader's Digest*. Tonight, Senators Harold H. Burton and Edwin Johnson, Congressman Clarence J. Brown, and Baukhage, are discussing the topic, "Should We Continue the Draft for at Least Two Years?"

For a complete copy of this discussion including the question period immediately following, send for the *Town Meeting Bulletin*. Just write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and enclose ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Now, Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now we're ready for the questions from this representative Cincinnati audience here in the Taft Auditorium in the city of Cincinnati. But before we get out into the audience, I'm going to ask my good friend, Dean Norman Auburn, Vice President Auburn, of the University of Cincinnati, who conducted the preliminary meeting to put a question to all four speakers that he propounded just before we went on the air.

Mr. Auburn: The policy of Selective Service in refusing to defer young men possessing scientific aptitudes has been criticized as scientific suicide. Our Allies—Britain, Russia, Canada, Australia—were not guilty of this mistake. They learned the lessons of

their shortsightedness in the last war. This time, they kept their promising technicians in the colleges while we lost several student generations of trained scientists, and the medical college deans tell us that there are no premedics ready for the September, 1946, medical college classes.

Now that the fighting stage of the war is over and if Selective Service is to be continued, wouldn't it be advisable to defer young men of scientific ability, so as to avoid a possible scientific bankruptcy and assure this country its continued leadership in technological development?

Mr. Denny: I'm going to ask all four speakers to comment on that starting with Congressman Brown.

Congressman Brown: Why, certainly those men should be deferred. Even Hitler, and you failed to mention him, had good enough sense to defer the boys who were studying science and medicine. Unless we defer them, we're not going to have either good policemen out of eighteen-year olds, or any doctors or scientists in the future.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Burton, would you comment on that question?

Senator Burton: I agree with Congressman Brown on that. I think it's clear that a war today is won by men in uniform and men in overalls and people at home and all around and one of the most helpful groups is the group of scientists, professional men throughout the country. I'm sure that any plan that is carried out to draft men for the future will have regard for those who can contribute scientifically.

Mr. Denny: Baukhage?

Mr. Baukhage: I agree with Senator Burton.

Mr. Denny: Senator Johnson?

Senator Johnson: I agree all the way down the line with the previous speakers, but I want to call the attention of Mr. Baukhage and Senator Burton to the fact that the present Selective Service Law does not agree with them and that's the law that they want to keep on for two more years. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now we'll go out in the audience and take this young man right on the aisle here. Yes?

Man: My question is for Mr. Baukhage. Mr. Baukhage, when an 18-year-old is drafted he will sacrifice his education. Only 14 per cent of the returning veterans have gone back to school. Is drafting men worth this? By the way, Mr. Baukhage, where would you be without your education? (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Oh, oh. Answer the last part of that question first, Baukhage.

Mr. Baukhage: I might be in the Army. (*Laughter.*) I was offered a commission in the Polish army after the last war.

Mr. Denny: All right. Now do you want to take the first part of the question?

Mr. Baukhage: Repeat that, will you please?

Mr. Denny: Will the young man repeat the first part of that question? All right, what is it, quickly?

Man: When an 18-year-old is drafted, he will have to sacrifice his education. Statistics have proved only 14 per cent of the returning veterans have gone back to school.

Mr. Baukhage: That doesn't necessarily prove that the rest won't. I found in college myself that some of the men who had a year off at some other pursuit—business—made much more serious

students than those who came directly from high school.

Mr. Denny: All right. We'll take the gentleman right here on the aisle. Yes?

Man: My friend, Clarence J. Brown. Justin A. Rome is my name. I'm a farmer. How do you propose to bring men home who have served more than two years in the armed service if you discontinue the draft?

Congressman Brown: Why I'd use some of the 2,000,000 men that have never seen any service? *(Applause.)* You'll remember in this Army there are more than 4,000,000 that have never been in combat, Justin. Read the papers, old man. *(Laughter and applause.)*

Mr. Denny: That plug about reading the papers. You're a publisher, aren't you?

Congressman Brown: That's right. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. Denny: Listen to the radio, too. The gentleman right here.

Man: Senator Burton. If we continue drafting men for the Army do you think the world will believe us when we say we want permanent peace?

Senator Burton: Yes, I do think the world will believe us all the more by doing it, because a part of our peace program is an agreement with the United Nations for the maintenance of a certain amount of armed forces, and our quota under those forces is one of the important things for which we

will need this Army we're talking about. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady right here.

Young Lady: To Senator Johnson. Is it necessary to eliminate the draft to keep us in school? Why not raise the draft age to twenty-one or twenty-two?

Mr. Denny: Well, he's already suggested—

Senator Johnson: Why not raise the draft age to fifty, if we need some people to send over to Japan and Germany? I don't believe in taking these 18-year-old boys. I want them to go to school, because that's where our security rests. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Here's a member of our Host Committee who has a question for Senator Burton.

Man: My name's Theodore Berry, a lawyer of Cincinnati. Senator Burton, will the Army and Navy accept, and Senator support, an effective provision in the draft extension law to completely eliminate racial segregation and discrimination in the armed services? *(Applause.)*

Senator Burton: I believe that's not in the law at the present time. I believe that the judgment of the forces themselves is the best way to handle that. I don't believe it's necessary to put it into a statute in order to work it out in the best way.

Mr. Denny: The lady with the red hat, please. Yes? Will you speak so we can hear you up here, please?

Lady: Senator Brown. I'd like to suggest that you—

Mr. Denny: Senator Brown! Yes. All right. (*Laughter.*)

Congressman Brown: I didn't hear that, please. Will you repeat?

Lady: Yes. I'd like to suggest that you give the volunteers a chance—those who would volunteer—and let the GI have a decent salary. I'm sure if they would be given a right living opportunity, they would volunteer. I am 100 per cent for raising the draft to 21 and send our boys to school.

Congressman Brown: Young lady, you show rare discretion and judgment. I thank you. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: The lady on the aisle here. Yes?

Lady: Mr. Baukhage asks Senator Johnson if he would be willing to trust the policing of Japan to Russia. Aren't we now trusting the policing of Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and other little Christian countries to the Russian armies now?

Mr. Baukhage: I think the meeting of foreign ministers in London is an effort to work out some arrangement whereby all the nations will have equal influence.

Mr. Denny: Yes, Mr. Brown?

Congressman Brown: That's exactly, Mr. Baukhage, what I'd like

for them to do in Japan. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady right here.

Lady: Senator Johnson. Shouldn't we construct our military system on a par with that of Russia and our greatest Allies? We shouldn't be either ahead of them or behind them. After all, maybe our militarists are looking at Pearl Harbor.

Senator Johnson: Well, I don't know that we should copy any totalitarian power. I don't happen to be one who ever wants to go to war with Russia. I'm not one who believes that we will ever go to war with Russia. But if we are ever to go to war with Russia, I hope that they place their dependence for their military security upon the draft. Because if they do, we'll whip them just like Hitler did France. You can't depend on the draft for military security. It won't work. It doesn't work.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here.

Man: Mr. Brown. I'd like to know why the people of the United States can't trust the so-called brass hats or generals now if they could trust them in wartime? (*Applause.*)

Congressman Brown: I want to answer that by saying that they didn't place their entire trust in the brass hats and by reminding you and the speakers here this evening that after all the Congress of the United States is charged under the

Constitution with the responsibility of raising and maintaining armies and not the War Department. It's Congress that should pass on this question. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentlemen right there. Yes?

Man: I have a question for Representative Brown. Why are the figures put out by the War Department necessarily deliberate propaganda, that is, with evil motive?

Congressman Brown: I didn't get it.

Man: Why are the figures put out by the War Department necessarily deliberate propaganda, that is, with an evil motive?

Congressman Brown: Well, now which figures do you mean? The ones they have given out this week to the Senate Committee? The ones they gave out last week to the House Committee? The ones they furnished me three weeks ago, or the ones they gave the country four weeks ago?

Man: Representative Brown—

Mr. Denny: Congressman Brown, he's talking back to you.

Man: Representative Brown, it seems to me that the War Department has able men in it and they would put out figures which require—

Congressman Brown: Yes, and as I said in my preliminary remark, there are three or four or five who make the policy and everybody else agrees or else. And

if you get in the Army, you'll find out that you'll agree or else. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The next gentleman.

Man: Mr. Baukhage, please. In order to encourage enlistments, why doesn't the Army offer the teen-age youth a better opportunity in the Army than he might expect in civilian life with regards to wages, job opportunities, and education?

Mr. Baukhage: Well, I think that's something that is up to Congress. Of course, the War Department or the Army can't decide how much they are going to pay. These gentlemen have to decide that. They are making every effort they can to get people in. As you know, certain inducements have been offered—too much to go into here.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman right here.

Man: Senator Burton. Should there be a draft deferment along educational lines for a student who wants to enter college to make something out of his life later. Why or why not?

Senator Burton: I'm so sorry. I couldn't get that.

Man: Should there be draft deferments along educational lines for a student who wants to go to college. Why or why not?

Senator Burton: Is the question should deferment be made if you want to enter college? My

thought along that line is that it probably would be best to work it out so that, just as soon as we could, the draftee would have the option of deciding the year in which he would take his military service. I think that is being contemplated just as soon as we can do it, so that if he wants to take it at 18 or 19 he can adjust that in order to get at it. But in any event, I think it is quite clear that under this system there wouldn't be longer than two years of service. There wouldn't be a long deferment. He'd have the full benefit of the GI Bill which gives him an extra chance in college. I believe that the men who go in the service either now, or in the war, has a better chance of getting his college education if he hadn't done it. A great many of them are going ahead with it and I congratulate them upon it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Burton.

Man: This is for Senator Johnson. I'm in the infantry occupation. Right now I'm enjoying 30 days at home. Senator Johnson seemingly has based his argument upon the defeat of Japan and Germany. I merely ask has Japan and has the Japanese army been physically and mentally defeated.

Senator Johnson: Not yet, but they are in the process of being defeated both mentally and physically. They are going to have their guns taken away from them. The

war criminals are going to be dealt with very severely and when we get through with that job, certainly we're not going to have to have 900,000 18-year-old boys over there to herd the Japanese.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman right here.

Man: The question is to Representative Brown. What do you honestly think of the record of voluntary enlistment since the War of 1898?

Congressman Brown: Well, I don't think we've really made any great efforts to get volunteers since the War of 1898, not at \$13 a month, and then at \$30 a month. Now we're trying to make it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Brown. Now, in just a minute we'll have summaries by these two United States Senators. While they prepare their summaries, here's a special announcement.

Announcer: In the current *Reader's Digest*, the well-known author, Jesse Stuart, now a lieutenant in the Naval Reserve, tells of an enlightening experience he had before the war.

"When I was a school superintendent in Greenup, Kentucky, I taught an American History course to high school seniors. Since my pupils didn't show enough interest in the textbook history of our country, I thought I'd supplement it with present-day magazine material.

"The students voted to use the school edition of *The Reader's Digest* one day a week. Each pupil chose the article he wanted to report on, and I thought we could easily give all the reports on the articles in one period. But so fervent was their interest, it took us a whole week to get through with the reports.

"That was one week in American History when I knew I had a class. The high school librarian also knew I had a class. My pupils went to the library and looked up the full-length articles in the magazines from which they had been condensed. From my room *The Reader's Digest* spread into the Science and English classes and to other places. My pupils were taking their *Digest's* home where their parents read them, or sons and daughters would read them aloud.

"One boy told me, 'My father can't read, but after I read him an article he said it had opened up something new to him. He asked me to read more and more to him until finally he had heard the whole magazine.'"

Then Superintendent Stuart knew *The Reader's Digest* was not only serving his classroom—it was going home to parents and they were being alerted on the world-wide problems of their day.

All the boys in that history class but one are now serving in the United States armed forces. We

hope that these boys, their parents, and their teachers are still reading, still discussing, and still enjoying the articles of *The Reader's Digest*.

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, *The Reader's Digest* returns you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Senator Johnson, may we have your summary for the negative, please?

Senator Johnson: Yes, Mr. Denny, we challenge the War Department's estimate that their needs are 2,500,000 men. We don't believe that they need 1,100,000 men in America to pick up cigarette butts and to mow lawns with their bayonets. (*Applause.*) We contend that the Army can get all the men it requires through the volunteer system. This system has never been tried. We hope that it will be tried faithfully and honestly.

We challenge the arguments that the battle-scarred veterans can only come home if we continue the draft. If that be so, why not draft enough men to let them all come home instead of just part of them. We challenge the argument that unless we continue the draft that we will chuck this Nation's international policy in the ash can. There's no basis for that kind of an argument.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Johnson. Now, Senator Burton, your summary for the affirmative, please.

Senator Burton: Baukhage and I, for the affirmative, have two points. The first of all is that we have nearly won the war and we must now maintain the peace that we have won and we must take no chances at letting that get away from us after the sacrifice that has been paid for it. Therefore, we must be sure that we have enough people to take care of our obligations in Germany and Japan and at home.

Our second point is, we believe we can best discharge that by the use of the draft, because the best authorities we have—the War Department, necessarily, the Navy Department, and the President of the United States—have said the Navy can be taken care of probably by the volunteer system, but 2,500,000 men for the Army—there's been no showing that they can be taken care of adequately by the volunteer system.

We dare not take the chance, therefore, with letting slip the victory that has been won at such great cost. Therefore, to my mind, there's a 900,000-man margin in the figures that have been given by the War Department. We don't dare disregard that margin and we do believe for the men, who have given more than two years of their life to the service, that they are now entitled to come home and someone who has not given any of their time to the service for the

present should take their place. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Burton, Senator Johnson, Congressman Brown, and Baukhage for your part in keeping this democratic process of open discussion alive. I also want to extend our hearty thanks to Station WSAI and this Town Meeting host committee headed by George Reavis, Assistant Superintendent of Schools of the city of Cincinnati.

What do you, our listeners, think about this important question on which our Congress will have to make a decision very soon? This is one of the scores of vital public questions on which you will be expected to have an enlightened opinion during the days ahead if we're going to keep our democracy alive. Friends, when you send us your opinion on tonight's topic, won't you send us your suggestions about future programs?

For instance, would you like to hear a discussion of this question, "Should Hirohito Be Tried as a War Criminal?" Or on the question, "Should Income and Wartime Taxes Be Drastically Reduced Now?" Would you like to hear a discussion of the proposal to increase the minimum wage to 65 cents an hour, or one on the 30-hour week bill? Are you interested in the topic suggested by the Pearl Harbor investigation, "Should We Have a Unified Command of All Our Armed Forces?"

These are among the subjects that we are considering for future programs. Remember, friends, this is your Town Meeting, and we want you to help us build these programs.

You've already indicated your interest in next week's topic—the question the whole world is asking. You know what it is. "Who Should Control the Atomic Bomb?" We return home to Town Hall in New York City next week and our speakers will be the bril-

liant military editor of the *New York Times*, Mr. Hansen Baldwin; the distinguished Republican Senator from the state of Maine, Owen Brewster; the well-known American network commentator and news analyst, Raymond Swing; and, just hot off the boat today, the European representative of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, Edward R. Murrow. (*Applause.*)

Announcer: Be sure to tune in next week when *The Reader's Digest* brings you Town Meeting.